

Explaining Fear of Crime as Fear of Rape Among College Females: An Examination of Multiple Campuses in the United States

Rhonda R. DOBBS*, Courtney A. WAID**, Tara O'Connor SHELLEY***

ABSTRACT

Given the fact that women are less likely to experience crime victimization than males, researchers have been puzzled for decades as to why women experience higher levels of fear of victimization. Scholars such as Warr (1984) and Ferraro (1995, 1996) argue that the fear of rape that females experience shadows fear of other crime, as rape is viewed by females as a cotemporaneous offense that may lead to other offenses. The present study examines the impact of fear of rape on the overall fear of crime for men and women on college campuses. While women are significantly more fearful of crime prior to controlling for fear of rape, the findings indicate that once fear of rape is considered, women's higher fear of other crimes seems to diminish such that there are either no sex differences in fear or men are more fearful than women. Relevant policy implications are discussed.

Keywords: Gender, College Women, Fear of Crime, Fear of Rape, Victimization Awareness

* The University of Texas at Arlington

** North Dakota State University

*** Colorado State University

Introduction

Since the 1960s, the fear of crime has emerged as a significant social issue (Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Stanko, 1995; Stinchcombe et al., 1980). Scholars such as Clemente and Kleiman (1977), Ferraro (1995, 1996), and Warr (1984, 2000) have articulated theoretical arguments postulating that the fear of crime can be as debilitating as victimization itself, because fear may cause avoidance behaviors similar to those incorporated into one's lifestyle after criminal victimization. Therefore, it can be expected that demographic groups experiencing higher levels of criminal victimization, such as young males, will experience elevated levels of fear. However, research has consistently shown that some groups, especially women and the elderly, are more fearful of crime, despite lower levels of victimization than young males (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977; Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Fetchenhauer & Buunk, 2005; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Garofalo, 1979; Parker & Ray, 1990; Parker et al., 1993; Stafford & Galle, 1984; Stanko, 1995; Warr, 1984, 2000). Other scholars have argued that men are affected by social desirability in self-report surveys examining fear; in other words, men may act in accord with the prescriptions of hegemonic masculinity and report lower levels of fear when in fact they may be quite fearful of crime (Smith & Torstensson, 1997; Sutton & Farrall, 2005). Furthermore, in considering social desirability in responding, feminist researchers have proposed that self-report surveys are inadequate in the assessment of abuse by intimate male partners, a form of abuse that may increase fear of criminal victimization among females (Hammer & Saunders, 1984; Kelly & DeKeseredy, 1994; Reid & Konrad, 2004; Riger, Gordon, & LeBailly, 1978; Smith, 1988; Stanko, 1987, 1990a, 1990b).

Nevertheless, the critical question remains: Why are females more fearful of crime? This perplexing trend has caused scholars to question what factors lead to higher levels of fear in women. Two key issues have been examined in the literature: (1) perceived vulnerability to crime, and (2) fear of rape. Perceived vulnerability refers to an individual's perceived ability to successfully defend themselves against an attack as well as their perceptions of their own strength and running speed compared to the average male and female (Gordon, Riger, LeBailly, & Heath, 1980; Riger et al., 1978). Some scholars argue that the physical weakness of females (as compared to males) limits self-defense ability (Bennett & Flavin, 1994; Katz, Webb, & Armstrong, 2003; Smith & Hill, 1991). If females feel more vulnerable, they will experience a higher fear of criminal victimization. Whereas perceived vulnerability to crime is a cognitive judgment, the fear of crime taps into an affective/emotional response (Ferraro, 1995). It has been argued that males experience elevated vulnerability to robbery, whereas females exhibit higher

level of perceived vulnerability to burglary and sexual assault (Reid & Konrad, 2004). An early study by Gordon and colleagues (1980) indicates that women's fear of crime decreases more than the fear of crime of men after controlling for perceived vulnerability; hence, vulnerability to victimization has more impact on female fear than male fear and may account for differences in levels of fear by sex. However, recent research indicates that the fear of crime for both sexes may serve to increase perceived vulnerability of victimization (Rader, 2004; Rader, May, & Goodrum, 2007).

Specific to fear of rape, research by Culbertson et al. (2001) and Smith (1988) indicates that females who have experienced sexual assault are more fearful of crime than women who have never been assaulted. Aside from direct experience with sexual assault, rape is viewed by those examining women's fear of crime as a perceptually contemporaneous offense. This means that the offense is "viewed as accompanying or ensuing from" other offense(s) (Warr, 1984, p. 695). Thus, the assumption is that women fear personally threatening offenses other than rape because they view these offenses as events that can lead to rape (Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Gordon & Riger, 1989; Warr, 1985; Lane & Meeker, 2003). Examples of these offenses include begging and burglary (Warr, 1984). Because of this, Warr (1984) contends that for women, "fear of crime *is* fear of rape" (p. 700). Utilizing this perspective, rape is seen as the master offense in explaining women's disproportionate fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Riger et al., 1978; Warr, 1984). Feminist scholars have noted that "gender inequality is associated with a culture of violence against women" (Yodanis, 2004, p. 670); given this, women are constantly aware of the threat of rape and that men control women through the power that ensues from it (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1994; Brownmiller, 1975, Softas-Nall, Bardos, Fakinis, 1995). Others working in this area contend that because the fear of rape is so powerful for women, it influences their daily routines and social behaviors (Gordon & Riger, 1989; Madriz, 1997; Stanko, 1990a, 1990b, 1992, 1995). This fear can be heightened by societal and media messages, some of which blame the victim in cases of sexual assault, and others that continually stress how females should avoid risky behavior (Gilchrist, Bannister, Ditton, & Farrell, 1998).

The elevated fear of crime that females experience as a result of perceived vulnerability and/or the fear of rape can lead them to engage in either avoidance or protective behaviors. When engaging in avoidance behaviors, a female may choose not to walk alone after dark, avoid dense urban areas and the establishments located in them (Cobbina, Miller, & Brunson, 2008: Garofalo, 1979) or remain inside her home with the doors locked, essentially

becoming a prisoner in her own home. In considering females who are victims of sexual assault by a known perpetrator, elevated levels of fear are reported in the home, most likely because the home serves as the setting of the offense (Culbertson, 2001; Kelly & DeKeseredy, 1994). Protective behaviors include the purchase of defense aids such as guns and home alarms, and completing self-defense courses (Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Gordon & Riger, 1989; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981). Recent theoretical discussions propose and subsequent research indicates that perceived risk to victimization, defensive/protective behaviors, and avoidance behavior all have reciprocal effects on the fear of crime. In other words, while the three may increase the fear of crime as indicated in previous research (Ferraro, 1995, 1996), the fear of crime may also serve to increase perceived vulnerability, avoidance behavior, and defensive/protective behavior (Rader, 2004; Rader et al., 2007).

Avoidance and protective behaviors may have specific implications for college-age females given the social context of dating relationships and the environmental context in which they interact with male students. Research suggests that women enrolled in colleges and universities "are at a greater risk for rape and other forms of sexual assault than women in the general population or in a comparable age group" (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000, p. 1). Female social interaction with male students is commonplace, and as Sloan, Lanier, and Beer (2000) note, substance use and abuse common among many social groups on college campuses can precipitate many violent and sex offenses. In a joint National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) report published in 2000, many female students are the target of verbal harassment, obscene phone calls, stalking, and forced sexual advances. This study found that in a given academic year, on average, close to three percent of females attending the colleges and universities from which the sample was drawn will experience an attempted or completed rape. This would amount to a rape rate of 27.7 per 1,000 female college students. Further, Fisher, et al. (2000) found incidence of rape was higher than the victimization rate as 23% of the rape victims had been victimized multiple times. While the occurrence of rape among college women may seem rather low when these figures are first examined, Fisher, et al. (2000) note that this measure accounts for just over 6 months of the year and does not contextualize the occurrence of rape over a college career. Extrapolating to a calendar year, almost 5% of college women are victims of attempted or completed rape (calendar year rate of 35.3 per 1,000). For a campus with 10,000 female students, this would amount to 353 rapes in a year. Applying these estimates to an entire college career, one-fifth to one-quarter of college women will experience an attempted or completed rape (Fisher, et al., 2000). It should also be noted that these figures only include

occurrence of attempted and completed rape and not other forms of sexual victimization.

Factors increasing the likelihood of these occurrences include living in campus residence halls, being of single status, engaging in drinking with social groups, and prior sexual victimization (Fisher, et al., 2000). Because of heightened fear related to these experiences, students, faculty, and staff on campuses across the country engage in avoidance and protective behaviors to prevent sexual victimization. Similar to the extant literature on the general female population, Fisher and Sloan (2003) indicate that female college students view rape as perceptually contemporaneous offense that shadows fear of other face-to-face victimization. Furthermore, their results indicate that perceived risk of rape among this population influences fear of rape and subsequent protective and avoidance behavior, a finding similar to that of Rader and colleagues concerning the general population (2004; 2007). McCreedy and Dennis (1996) note that approximately 30% of students avoid night classes when possible, and those with prior sexual assault experience do so at a greater rate. However, another study by Griffith, Hueston, Wilson, Moyers, and Hart (2004) notes that only eight percent of females employ avoidance and protective behavior while on campus.

Only in recent years have campus sexual assault incidents been considered public record. Before the passage of the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990, crime incidents on campuses were considered educational records, and thus considered protected information. After the passage of 1990 Act, post-secondary schools were required to report crime statistics, and the schools complying were eligible to receive funding to aid in the endeavor. The Clery Act, passed in 2000, requires colleges and universities across the United States to report campus crime as well as incidents that occur in residential and commercial areas contiguous to campus. Furthermore, the Act calls for schools to receive to receive punishment for nonparticipation in the reporting of these offenses. However, as Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard (2007) note, campus crime continues to be underreported, mostly due to “jurisdictional confusion, organizational inefficiency, and concern with student (offender) confidentiality” (p. 222). In addition, some forms of victimization such as interpersonal and dating violence are more likely to go unreported to the police and are consistently unaccounted for in campus crime reports. Related to interpersonal and dating violence is the finding by Turner and Torres (2006) that women often do not feel safe in residence halls. Because of this, students may not become involved in campus activities to the level that they desire (Currie, 1994), which limits the development of positive social networks. It has been established that the majority of offenses against college

women occur between acquaintances (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998). Yet, women may be more fearful of crimes they are less vulnerable to, such as stranger-perpetrated offenses for which Clery requires schools to report (Day, 1994; Jennings, Gover, Pudrzynska, 2007; Fisher et al., 2000; Softas-Nall et al., 1995; Wilcox et al., 2007).

Methodology

The present study seeks to examine the impact of the fear of rape on the overall fear of crime for both men and women on college campuses. Self-administered surveys were distributed on three college campuses in three different regions of the U.S., one in the southeast, one in the southwest, and one in the west. It is expected that different campuses would exhibit different levels of fear of crime and fear of rape, specifically, for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to geographic location, size of the campus as well as the surrounding area, the incidence of crime on campus and in the surrounding area, racial composition of campus, and the proportion of students living on campus. While levels of fear are expected to differ across the campuses, it is less clear whether the impact of fear of rape on the overall fear of crime will be uniform across the campuses. It is possible that the impact of fear of rape will differ across the campuses, which has yet to be examined in previous research. If it does differ, this would have implications for developing an appropriate response that is campus specific.

Surveys were administered on the southwestern campus during a three week period in April 2007. The total student population at this university is just over 25,000. Data was collected during August 2007 at a university in the southeast with a total student population over 41,000. Surveys were administered during March 2008 at a university in the west with a student population just over 26,000. All three campuses are public 4-year universities. Participants were informed that their involvement in the study was voluntary and the results would be anonymous. Surveys were administered in classes that were purposively chosen based on the instructor's willingness to forego class time to administer the survey. Both lower and upper division classes were chosen for survey administration as were classes in several different disciplines. Students in the sample constitute a convenience sample of those who were present on the day of survey administration and who volunteered to complete the questionnaire. A total of 961 students completed the survey, 454 on the southwestern campus, 242 on the southeastern campus, and 265 on the western campus.

Findings and Discussion

Fear of crime was measured by asking respondents how fearful they were of being the victim of nine specific crimes (murder, attack with a weapon, robbed/mugged, beaten up/assaulted by strangers, approached on street by beggars, home broken into, car stolen, property vandalized/damaged, cheated/conned out of money). Respondents were also asked to rank their perceived likelihood of being the victim of a violent crime and a property crime within the next year. Each of these was measured on a scale of 0-10, with 0 representing no fear and not at all likely respectively.

Table 1. Independent Variables Used in Analysis

Variable Description	Coding	Mean (st. dev.)
Fear rape	0=not at all fearful; 10=very fearful	4.68 (3.83)
Concern about crime	0=not at all concerned; 10=very concerned	6.93 (2.10)
Victimization experience	0=no; 1=yes	.47 (.50)
Family victimization experience	0=no; 1=yes	.63 (.48)
Crime has increased	0=crime decreased/stayed same in last year; 1=crime increased in last year	.15 (.36)
Likelihood of violent victimization in next year	0=not at all likely; 10=very likely	2.33 (2.48)
Likelihood of property victimization in next year	0=not at all likely; 10=very likely	3.57 (2.82)
Major	0=non-CRCJ; 1=CRCJ major	.35 (.48)
Sex	0=male; 1=female	.58 (.49)
White	0=non-white; 1=white (reference category)	.60 (.49)
Black	0=non-black; 1=black	.14 (.34)
Hispanic	0=non-Hispanic; 1=Hispanic	.18 (.38)
Other Race	0=non-other; 1=other race	.09 (.28)
Age	respondent's age in years	21.12 (3.59)

Independent variables included in the analysis of fear are presented in Table 1. As shown, respondent's concern about crime, perception that crime has increased, and perceived likelihood of victimization in the next year are included in the analysis. The respondent's victimization experience as well as the victimization experience of close family members is also considered. The demographic variables are sex, age, and race/ethnicity. Lastly, respondent's major as being CRCJ (criminology/criminal justice) or not is also included as CRCJ majors have been shown to be less fearful in other fear of crime research on campuses.

Table 2. Mean Differences for Fear and Perceived Risk by Sex

	Total		Southwest		Southeast		West	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<u>Fear:</u>								
Rape	1.91 (3.05)	6.72*** (2.97)	2.15 (3.21)	7.08*** (2.93)	1.94 (3.22)	6.44*** (2.99)	1.47 (2.52)	6.39*** (2.77)
Murder	3.21 (3.34)	5.50*** (3.51)	3.67 (3.55)	6.16*** (3.44)	3.35 (3.39)	4.95*** (3.46)	2.25 (2.97)	4.90*** (3.48)
Attack w/weapon	3.75 (3.13)	6.39*** (3.01)	4.01 (3.26)	7.05*** (2.93)	4.07 (3.16)	5.86*** (2.93)	2.98 (2.72)	5.77*** (2.99)
Break into home	4.53 (2.99)	6.55*** (2.99)	4.58 (3.09)	7.12*** (2.85)	4.95 (3.05)	6.11** (2.93)	4.02 (2.71)	6.01*** (3.11)
Car stolen	4.21 (3.23)	5.54*** (3.27)	4.68 (3.20)	6.46*** (3.07)	3.70 (3.10)	5.00** (3.22)	3.88 (3.31)	4.50 (3.22)
Robbed/mugged	3.66 (3.09)	5.67*** (3.17)	3.90 (3.16)	6.50*** (3.08)	3.92 (3.23)	5.29** (2.99)	2.95 (2.72)	4.66*** (3.11)
Property vandalized	4.46 (3.02)	5.40*** (3.12)	4.58 (3.08)	6.23*** (2.99)	4.41 (3.00)	4.77 (3.11)	4.30 (2.95)	4.58 (2.98)
Cheated/conned	3.83 (3.22)	5.07*** (3.23)	4.12 (3.40)	5.91*** (3.24)	3.69 (3.21)	4.31 (3.11)	3.44 (2.84)	4.39* (3.00)
Approached by beggar	2.72 (2.99)	4.31*** (3.27)	2.85 (3.02)	5.09*** (3.53)	3.55 (3.26)	4.14 (3.11)	1.63 (2.27)	3.21*** (2.92)
Beaten up by strangers	2.97 (3.01)	5.01*** (3.48)	3.29 (3.15)	5.89*** (3.49)	3.05 (3.16)	4.32** (3.28)	2.30 (2.47)	4.18*** (3.29)
<u>Perceived Risk:</u>								
Violent Crime	2.19 (2.47)	2.44 (2.51)	2.28 (2.43)	2.73 (2.75)	2.29 (2.59)	1.91 (2.18)	1.94 (2.44)	2.44 (2.29)
Property Crime	3.69 (2.84)	3.49 (2.82)	3.60 (2.83)	3.87 (3.03)	3.81 (2.87)	3.11* (2.58)	3.74 (2.84)	3.20 (2.57)

***p<.001; p<.01; *p<.05

T-tests measuring mean differences between men and women in the overall sample as well as each subsample are presented in Table 2. Consistent with previous research on both general populations and college populations, women's fear of crime is generally higher than men's, especially for those offenses that would involve face-to-face interaction (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977; Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Garofalo, 1979; Warr, 1984, 2000). There were statistically significant differences by sex for fear of all violent crimes measured in the total sample as well as in each campus subsample when examined separately. The only item that would involve face-to-face contact that did not result in a statistically significant difference by sex was fear of being approached by a beggar or panhandler for the sample from the southeast campus. For the total sample and each of the subsamples, the largest difference in means was for the fear of rape/sexual assault item. Further, for women, the highest mean for the fear items was for fear of rape for the total sample and two of the three subsamples (southeast and west). For the southwest sample, fear of someone breaking into your home had a slightly higher mean (7.12) than did fear of rape (7.08).

Similar to previous research (Reid & Konrad, 2004), fear of each of the property crimes was significantly higher for women in the total and southwest sample. Fear of having your home broken into was the only property crime for which there was a statistically significant difference by sex among the southeast sample. Since the measure did not specify whether the respondent was home when the break-in would occur, it is possible that respondents interpreted this as a potential face-to-face victimization. This was also the highest mean fear for each of the samples. For the west sample, there were no significant mean differences for having your car stolen or having property vandalized. While women were significantly more fearful of being conned, this was only at the $p < .05$ level.

When examining perceived risk of crime, few differences were observed, with the exception of risk of property crime at the southeast campus. Interestingly, it is men in this sample that perceive more risk of property victimization in the next year. While this difference is significant, it should be noted that it is only at the $p < .05$ level. Perceived risk is generally quite low for both violent and property crimes. This finding is in accord with previous research (Ferraro 1995, 1996) that suggests perceived risk of crime is generally lower than fear of crime.

In order to more vigorously test the impact of fear of rape on fear of crime by sex, multivariate OLS models were estimated for each of the fear of crime variables for the total sample and each of the subsamples. Previous research

indicates that fear of rape should shadow fear of crimes that involve face-to-face interactions, including murder, robbery, being beaten up, being attacked with a weapon, being approached by a beggar, and possibly home burglary. Theoretically, fear of rape should have less impact on the property crimes (car stolen, property vandalized, and being conned), although Fisher and Sloan (2003) did find fear of rape to shadow larceny/theft. Given the t-test results, fear of rape is expected to shadow fear of violent crimes in each of the samples, but might shadow property crimes less so for the southeast and west samples. Partial results for the OLS models are presented below. Full regression models were estimated for each sample, however, for the sake of conciseness only the theoretically relevant variables of sex and fear of rape are presented in the tables. The other independent variables included in the various analyses are displayed in Table 1.

Table 3. Partial OLS Results for Fear of Specific Crimes – Total Sample

	Murder		Attacked w/ weapon		Robbery		Beaten up		Approached by beggar	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.55*** (.21)	-1.64*** (.20)	2.01*** (.19)	-.84*** (.17)	1.41*** (.19)	-1.01*** (.21)	1.26*** (.21)	-1.20*** (.22)	1.26*** (.21)	.15 (.26)
Fear of Rape		.77*** (.03)		.66*** (.03)		.56*** (.03)		.58*** (.03)		.25*** (.04)
Adjusted R ²	.36	.66	.41	.68	.35	.55	.35	.54	.21	.25

	Break into home		Car stolen		Property vandalized		Cheated/conned	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.61*** (.19)	-.70** (.20)	.95*** (.21)	-1.06*** (.24)	.61** (.19)	-1.17*** (.22)	.79*** (.21)	-.94*** (.25)
Fear of Rape		.53*** (.03)		.46*** (.03)		.40*** (.03)		.39*** (.04)
Adjusted R ²	.27	.48	.25	.40	.26	.38	.22	.33

b and (standard error) reported

***p<.001; **p<.02; *P<.05

The OLS results for fear of each of the specific crimes in the total sample are presented in Table 3. Model 1 represents the best fit model explaining fear of that crime. As shown, women (coded as 1) in the total sample were significantly more fearful of each of the types of crime examined. Model 2 represents the best fit model with fear of rape included. Once fear of rape is included in the model, women are significantly less fearful of eight of the nine types of crime. There were no sex differences for fear of being approached by a beggar once fear of rape was controlled. Fear of rape was

significant in each of the models. For all nine offenses, then, women's higher fear was accounted for by their fear of rape.

Table 4. Partial OLS Results for Fear of Specific Crimes - Southwestern Campus

	Murder		Attacked w/ weapon		Robbery		Beaten up		Approached by beggar	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.91*** (.32)	-1.65*** (.28)	2.40*** (.28)	-.63* (.26)	1.91*** (.28)	-.53 (.29)	1.96*** (.30)	-.55 (.33)	1.89*** (.31)	.66 (.39)
Fear of Rape		.79*** (.04)		.67*** (.04)		.54*** (.04)		.55*** (.05)		.27*** (.05)
Adjusted R ²	.36	.69	.41	.70	.42	.61	.40	.57	.28	.33

	Break into home		Car stolen		Property vandalized		Cheated/conned	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.93*** (.28)	-.55 (.33)	1.35*** (.30)	-.54 (.33)	1.09*** (.28)	-.74* (.33)	1.27*** (.33)	-.57 (.39)
Fear of Rape		.55*** (.04)		.42*** (.05)		.40*** (.04)		.41*** (.05)
Adjusted R ²	.33	.55	.27	.38	.31	.43	.23	.33

b and (standard error) reported

***p<.001; **p<.02; *P<.05

Table 5. Partial OLS Results for Fear of Specific Crimes-Southeastern Campus

	Murder		Attacked w/ weapon		Robbery		Beaten up		Approached by beggar	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	2.05** (.37)	-1.47*** (.35)	1.63*** (.34)	-1.01** (.33)	.90* (.37)	-1.15** (.40)	.76* (.37)	-1.63*** (.38)	.62 (.42)	-.78 (.49)
Fear of Rape		.80*** (.05)		.61*** (.05)		.52*** (.06)		.59*** (.06)		.31*** (.06)
Adjusted R ²	.34	.66	.33	.61	.26	.45	.32	.54	.01	.09

	Break into home		Car stolen		Property vandalized		Cheated/conned	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.16** (.36)	-.88* (.41)	1.06* (.40)	-.89* (.44)	.25 (.36)	-1.35** (.42)	.18 (.38)	-1.27** (.44)
Fear of Rape		.47*** (.06)		.47*** (.06)		.37*** (.06)		.35*** (.07)
Adjusted R ²	.22	.39	.14	.30	.23	.34	.23	.31

b and (standard error) reported

***p<.001; **p<.02; *P<.05

The results for the southwest campus are displayed in Table 4. Similar to the total sample, women were significantly more fearful of each of the nine specific crimes in each of the best fit models (Model 1). Again, once included, fear of rape was significant in each model and accounted for this higher fear of crime, with women being significantly less fearful in three of the nine models and no significant sex differences appearing in the other six. Results for the southeastern campus (Table 5) are similar in terms of the impact of fear of rape. Although there were fewer significant sex differences in the initial models than in the total sample and the southwest sample, fear of rape is significant in each of the models when included. Further, women are significantly less fearful for eight of the nine crimes in this sample. As indicated in Table 6, the findings were similar for the western campus, with women generally being more fearful in the initial models and fear of rape being a significant predictor once added to the model. Further, women are significantly less fearful in the second models for seven of the nine crimes and there are no statistically significant results for the other two crimes.

Table 6. Partial OLS Results for Fear of Specific Crimes – Western Campus

	Murder		Attacked w/ weapon		Robbery		Beaten up		Approached by beggar	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	2.05*** (.37)	-1.47*** (.35)	2.12*** (.33)	-1.06** (.31)	1.08** (.36)	-1.68*** (.38)	1.33*** (.37)	-1.34** (.41)	1.50*** (.34)	.31 (.45)
Fear of Rape		.80*** (.05)		.73*** (.05)		.64*** (.06)		.61*** (.06)		.24*** (.06)
Adjusted R ²	.34	.66	.39	.69	.25	.50	.23	.45	.13	.18

	Break into home		Car stolen		Property vandalized		Cheated/conned	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	1.70*** (.37)	-.77 (.42)	.56 (.40)	-2.21*** (.46)	.36 (.34)	-1.46** (.43)	.63 (.36)	-.92* (.45)
Fear of Rape		.54*** (.06)		.57*** (.06)		.37*** (.06)		.34*** (.06)
Adjusted R ²	.22	.41	.16	.37	.21	.32	.21	.29

b and (standard error) reported

***p<.001; **p<.02; *P<.0

In each of the samples examined here, fear of rape was generally found to shadow fear of other forms of crime, whether they were violent crimes that would involve face-to-face interaction or property crimes. Once fear of rape is considered, women's higher fear of other crimes seems to diminish such that there are either no sex differences in fear or men are more fearful than

women. In order to determine whether fear of rape operates differently on general fear of crime than other crime-specific fears, similar analyses were conducted, although not reported here, that indicated that fear of crimes other than rape did not have this same impact on sex differences related to fear of specific crimes. For example, when modeling fear of murder, controlling for fear of being robbed did not change the direction of the coefficient for sex. Women remained significantly more fearful when fear of being robbed was considered as an explanatory variable for fear of murder. Thus, the data indicate that there is something about fear of rape that drives the fear of other crimes for women. These findings are in accord with previous research examining the impact the relationship of sex and fear of crime (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977; Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Fetchenhauer & Buunk, 2005; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Garofalo, 1979; Parker & Ray, 1990; Parker et al., 1993; Stafford & Galle, 1984; Stanko, 1995; Warr, 1984, 2000).

The standardized coefficients (betas) for the fear of rape variable was the highest of all standardized coefficients in each model, indicating that fear of rape is the best explanatory variable included. Examining the change in the R-squares from model 1 to model 2 indicates that the explanatory value of the equations for violent crimes generally increased more so with the inclusion of fear of rape than did the property crimes. This is perhaps an indication that fear of rape more strongly shadows fear of violent crimes which are more likely to involve face to face contact than property crimes. This was true for the total sample and for each individual campus examined.

The findings presented here also indicate that there are differences across campuses in regards to gender and fear of crime. In the southwestern sample, women were more fearful of all nine types of crime in the initial models, whereas women were more fearful in six of the nine initial models on each of the other two campuses. Higher fear among college women, then, is not uniform across different places. There was some similarity across the other two campuses in terms of what crimes did not yield significant sex differences. Specifically, on the southeastern campus, there were no initial differences between men and women for being approached by a beggar, having your property vandalized, and being cheated or conned out of your money. On the western campus, there were no sex differences for having your car stolen, having property vandalized, or being cheated or conned out of your money.

The gender differences were also not uniform across the campuses in the second models (controlling for fear of rape). Again, the southwestern campus stands out as being somewhat different than the other two. Once

fear of rape is controlled, men were more fearful for three of the crimes examined (murder, being attacked with a weapon, and having your property vandalized). For the other six types of crime, there were no gender differences. In the other two samples, men were more fearful once rape was controlled for the majority of the crimes, in eight of the nine models on the southeastern campus and seven of the nine models on the western campus. While the impact of fear of rape is uniform in dampening the fear of other crimes for women, it seems to have a differential impact across campuses. It is unclear exactly why the southwest campus stands out from the other two in terms of fear, although reasonable speculation can be made. While it is the smallest of the campuses in terms of enrollment, it is located in the midst of a large metropolitan area whereas the other two campuses are located in less populous areas. Previous research has shown fear to be highest in urban areas, so this likely accounts for at least some of the differences in fear across campus. It is less clear why the gender differences would be less pronounced among respondents from the southwest campus. It could be related to the location of the campus, although it is possible that there are other factors involved.

Policy Implications

As Jennings et al. (2007) note, physical and social changes are necessary when considering the development and implementation of policies, as one without the other will be insufficient in attempts to reduce fear among females attending colleges and universities today. From a structural/physical standpoint, lighting can be improved, and new buildings can be planned to maximize natural light and allow for optimal space between buildings (Day, 1994). Furthermore, blue-light telephones have been implemented with greater frequency on campuses across the United States in recent years. By-and-large, this policy has been met with favoritism by administrators and students (Day, 1994; Wilcox et al., 2007).

Social programs provided to students can take a variety of forms, such as awareness programs and education for all students, self-defense courses for female students, and neighborhood watch in residential areas contiguous to campus. As Fisher and Sloan (2003) note, programs should be developed to counter actual and real social risks. If females can understand which crimes and in what situations they are most vulnerable through proactive programming, the lives of women on campuses across the United States will be enhanced, and many will not find interruption in their daily lives. This approach to programming is imperative given the nature of victimization among college females, as many who fall victim to crime do so at the hands

of someone they know (Day, 1994; Jennings, et al., 2007; Fisher et al., 2000; Softas-Nall et al., 1995; Wilcox et al., 2007). Awareness and education programs can be required of all incoming students, members of fraternities and sororities, and all student-athletes (Day, 1994; Fisher & Sloan, 2003). These programs are imperative for females who have been victims of sexual assault in the past, as those who have been victimized before are more likely than their counterparts to be sexually victimized again (Jennings et al., 2007). Programs may focus on the consequences of alcohol and substance use/abuse and the accuracy of crime reporting on campus. Programs could also encourage and espouse reporting of crime to campus authorities and assurance that support will be made available to reporting victims. Education and awareness programs have been criticized in the past for advocating avoidance. Scholars such as Day (1994) have noted that much of the sexual victimization awareness promoted on college campuses in the past two decades has largely reinforced gender social norms. Unfortunately, programs of this nature may increase avoidance behaviors, thus serving to remove the female student from the complete college experience (Currie, 1994). For this reason, it is important to create awareness and prevention programs aimed at men and their behaviors and responsibility in regards to sexual violence. In addition to education and awareness, scholars have advocated that self-defense courses are effective in reducing the amount of perceived risk that college females experience. The rationale is that even in situations where the actual likelihood of victimization does not decrease, females completing self-defense programs are likely to feel empowered and in control of various social situations (Weitlauf, Smith, & Cervone, 2000). This is tantamount considering the lives of female college students are largely driven by their social interaction with males of a similar age on campus or in residential or commercial areas close to campus.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, R. R., & Flavin, J. M. (1994). Determinants of fear of crime: The effect of cultural setting. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(3), 357-381.
- Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P.L. (1994). Surveying campus crime: What can be done to reduce crime and fear? *Security Journal*, 5(3), 160-171.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Clemente, F., & Kleiman, M. (1977). Fear of crime in the United States: A multivariate analysis. *Social Forces*, 56(2), 519-531.
- Cobbina, J. E., Miller, J., & Brunson, R. K. (2008). Gender, neighborhood danger, and risk avoidance strategies among urban African American youth. *Criminology*, 46(3), 673-709.

- Culbertson, K., Vik, P., & Kooiman, B. (2001). The impact of sexual assault, sexual assault perpetrator type, and location of sexual assault on ratings of perceived safety. *Violence Against Women, 7*(8), 858-875.
- Currie, D. (1994). Women's safety on campus: Challenging the University as a gendered space. *Humanity and Society, 18*(3), 24-48.
- Day, K. (1994). Conceptualizing women's fear of sexual assault on campus. *Environment & Behavior, 26*(6), 742-765.
- Ferraro, K.F. (1995). *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ferraro, K. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces, 75*(2), 667-690.
- Fetchenhauer, D., & Buunk, B. (2005). How to explain gender differences in fear of crime: Towards an evolutionary approach. *Sexualities, Evolution & Gender, 7*(2), 95-113.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs.
- Fisher, B.S., & Sloan, J.J. III. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis supported? *Justice Quarterly, 20*(3), 633-659.
- Garofalo, J. (1979). Victimization and the fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16*(1), 80-97.
- Gilchrist, E., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., & Farrall, S. (1998). Women and the fear of crime: Challenging the accepted stereotype. *British Journal of Criminology, 38*(2), 283-298.
- Gordon, M.T. & Riger, S. (1989). *The Female Fear: The Social Cost of Rape*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Gordon, M.T., Riger, S., LeBailly, R.K., & Heath, L. (1980). Crime, women, and the quality of urban life. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5*(3), 144-160.
- Griffith, J. D., Hueston, E., Wilson, C., Moyers, & Hart, C. L. (2004). Satisfaction with campus police services. *College Student Journal, 38*(1), 150-56.
- Hammer, J., & Saunders, S. (1984). *Well-Founded Fear: A Community Study of Violence to Women*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jennings, W., Gover, A., & Pudrzynskas, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(2), 191-208.
- Katz, C.M., Webb, V.J., & Armstrong, T.A. (2003). Fear of gangs: A test of alternative theoretical models. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(1), 95-130.
- Kelly, K.D., & DeKeseredy, W.S. (1994). Women's fear of crime and abuse in college and university dating relationships. *Violence & Victims, 9*(1), 17-30.

- Lane, J., & Meeker, J. W. (2003). Women's and men's fear of gang crimes: Sexual and nonsexual assault as perceptually contemporaneous offenses. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(2), 337-371.
- McCreeedy, K.R., & Dennis, B.G. (1996). Sex-related offenses and fear of crime on campus. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 69-80.
- Madriz, E. (1997). *Nothing Bad Happens to Good Girls: Fear of Crime in Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parker, K.D., McMorris, B.J., Smith, E., & Murty, K.S. (1993). Fear of crime and the likelihood of victimization: A bi-ethnic comparison. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(5), 723-732.
- Parker, K.D., & Ray, M.C. (1990). Fear of crime: An assessment of related factors. *Sociological Spectrum*, 10, 29-40.
- Rader, N.E. (2004). The threat of victimization: A theoretical re-conceptualization of fear of crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24(6), 689-704.
- Rader, N., May, D., & Goodrum, S. (2007). An empirical assessment of the threat of victimization: Considering fear of crime, perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. *Sociological Spectrum*, 27(5), 475-505.
- Reid, L., & Konrad, M. (2004). The gender gap in fear: Assessing the interactive effects of gender and perceived risk on fear of crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24(4), 399-425.
- Riger, S., Gordon, M.T., & LeBailly, R. (1978). Women's fear of crime from blaming to restricting the victim. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 3, 274-284.
- Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sloan, J.J., Lanier, M.M., & Beer, D.L. (2000). Policing the contemporary university campus: Challenging traditional organizational models. *Journal of Security Administration*, 23(1), 1-20.
- Smith, L.N. & Hill, G.D. (1991). Perceptions of crime seriousness and fear of crime. *Sociological Focus*, 24(4), 315-327.
- Smith, M.D. (1988). Women's fear of violent crime: An exploratory test of a feminist hypothesis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3(1), 29- 38
- Smith, W., & Torstensson, M. (1997). Gender differences in risk perception and neutralizing fear of crime: Toward resolving the paradoxes. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37(4), 608-634.
- Softas-Nall, B., Bardos, A., & Fakinos, M. (1995). Fear of rape: Its perceived seriousness and likelihood among young Greek women. *Violence Against Women*, 1(2), 174-186.
- Stafford, M.C., & Galle, O.R. (1984). Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 22(2), 173-185.

- Stanko, E. (1987). Typical violence, normal precaution: Men, women and interpersonal violence in England, Wales, Scotland and the USA. In J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (Eds), *Women, Violence, and Social Control*. London: Macmillan
- Stanko, E.A. (1990a). *The Case of Fearful Women: Gender, Personal Safety and the Fear of Crime*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Baltimore.
- Stanko, E. (1990b). *Everyday Violence: How Women and Men Experience Sexual and Physical Danger*. London: HarperCollins.
- Stanko, E. (1992). The case of fearful women: Gender, personal safety, and fear of crime. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 4(1), 117-135.
- Stanko, E. (1995). Women, crime, and fear. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 539(1), 46-58.
- Stinchcombe, A.L., Adams, R., Fleimer, C.A., Scheppele, K.L., Smith, T.W., & Taylor, D.G. (1980). *Crime and Punishment: Changing Attitudes in America*. Jossey Bass.
- Sutton, R.M., & Farrall, S. (2005). Gender, socially desirable responding and the fear of crime: Are women really more anxious about crime? *The British Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 212-224.
- Turner, K.B., & Torres, A. (2006). Campus safety: Perceptions and experience of women students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 20-36.
- Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why are women and the elderly more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*, 65(3), 681-702.
- Warr, M. (1985). Fear of rape among urban women. *Social Problems*, 32(3), 238-250.
- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for research and policy. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Measurement and analysis of criminal justice*, Vol. 4 of *Crime and Justice 2000*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Weitlauf, J.C., Smith, R.E., & Cervone, D. (2000). Generalization effects of coping-skills training: Influence of self-defense training on women's efficacy beliefs, assertiveness, and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 625-633.
- Wilcox, P., Jordan, C., & Pritchard, A. (2007). A multidimensional examination of campus safety: Victimization, perceptions of danger, worry about crime, and precautionary behavior among college women in the post-Clery era. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(2), 219-254.
- Yodanis, C.L. (2004). Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear: A cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(6), 655-675.